



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,152	01/04/2007	Joacim Elmen	64190(45120)	1052
21874	7590	09/15/2009	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP			ANGELL, JON E	
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02205			1635	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/15/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/550,152	ELMEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	J. E. Angell	1635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 67-101 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 67-101 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 67-101 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 67-97, drawn to a double stranded compound comprising at least one LNA monomer having the first structure (on the left) of claim 67.

Group II, claim(s) 67-97, drawn to a double stranded compound comprising at least one LNA monomer having the second structure (on the right) of claim 67

Group III, claim(s) 98 and 99, drawn to a method of treating cancer using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group IV, claim(s) 98 and 99, drawn to a method of treating cancer using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group V, claim(s) 100, drawn to a method of treating SARS using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group VI, claim(s) 100, drawn to a method of treating SARS using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group VII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating atherosclerosis using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group VIII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating atherosclerosis using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group IX, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating psoriasis using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group X, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating psoriasis using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group XI, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating diabetic retinopathy using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group XII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating diabetic retinopathy using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group XIII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating rheumatic arthritis using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group XIV, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating rheumatic arthritis using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group XV, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating asthma using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group XVI, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating asthma using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group XVII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating warts using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group XVIII, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating warts using a double stranded compound of Group II.

Group XIX, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating allergic dermatitis using a double stranded compound of Group I.

Group XX, claim(s) 101, drawn to a method for treating allergic dermatitis using a double stranded compound of Group II.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-XX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: there technical feature linking the claims is not a special technical feature. Applicants are respectfully reminded that PCT Rule 13.2 states "The expression 'special technical features' shall mean those technical features that define a

contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes *over the prior art.*" (Emphasis added). In the instant claims the technical feature linking the Inventions is the double stranded compound of claim 67. However, claim 67 does not make a contribution over the prior art in view of U.S. 2004/0096848 (Thrue et al., cited by Applicants in 2/14/2006 IDS). Thrue teaches a double stranded compound comprising a LNA monomer as set forth in claim 67 (e.g., see claims 1-8 of Thrue et al.). Therefore, the technical feature is not a "special" technical feature and unity of invention does not exist between the different categories of invention.

Applicants are also respectfully reminded that 37 CFR 1.475(e) states, "The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternative within a single claim."

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

The chemotherapeutic agents of claim 99.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (i.e., a single chemotherapeutic agent of claim 99) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 98, 99.

4. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the chemotherapeutic agents were well known in the prior art.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. E. Angell whose telephone number is 571-272-0756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Douglas Schultz can be reached on 571-272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. E. Angell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635